

## Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Summary

### Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

#### Section A: Overview & Summary Information

**Date Investment First Submitted:** 2009-06-30  
**Date of Last Change to Activities:** 2012-08-31  
**Investment Auto Submission Date:** 2012-02-28  
**Date of Last Investment Detail Update:** 2012-07-31  
**Date of Last Exhibit 300A Update:** 2012-07-31  
**Date of Last Revision:** 2012-08-31

**Agency:** 014 - Department of State      **Bureau:** 00 - Agency-Wide Activity

**Investment Part Code:** 01

**Investment Category:** 00 - Agency Investments

**1. Name of this Investment:** Travel Manager Program

**2. Unique Investment Identifier (Ull):** 014-000000014

#### Section B: Investment Detail

- Provide a brief summary of the investment, including a brief description of the related benefit to the mission delivery and management support areas, and the primary beneficiary(ies) of the investment. Include an explanation of any dependencies between this investment and other investments.**

This investment is geared towards complying with the Federal Travel Regulation (FTR) that mandates the enterprise-wide use of a GSA approved e-Travel solution. More specifically, this investment involves migrating from the GELCO-based Travel Management System to CW Government Travel's e2 Solutions (the e-Travel offering selected by the Department) and operating the legacy travel management system until the transition to e2 Solutions is complete. In addition to the government-wide share-in cost savings and other gains noted in GSA's business case, this investment will yield two major operational improvements: - The productivity gains/reduced transaction fees derived from using an Online Booking Tool. This, coupled with lower travel agent fees, will likely lead to improved morale and projected airline booking fee savings of approximately \$900K per year. - Worldwide paperless processing including automated electronic routing and approvals, which should yield better controls/accountability and an expected financial benefit of almost \$750K per year. This investment is dependent on the following Department of State major investments: \* JFMS -- the financial systems operated and maintained under this investment generate travel reimbursements \* GFACS -- which provides automated feeds of personnel data to ensure that travel is authorized for only active employees as well as provide e2 Solutions with the correct bank routing information for reimbursements \* IT Infrastructure which provides the communications backbone needed to access this cloud-based solution from inside the

Department's firewall.

**2. How does this investment close in part or in whole any identified performance gap in support of the mission delivery and management support areas? Include an assessment of the program impact if this investment isn't fully funded.**

The Department's vision for empowering diplomacy and development with information and tools available anytime, anywhere" cannot be achieved without a world-class travel support system, especially for international travel. This investment addresses this performance gap through the world-wide deployment of an end-to-end, cloud-based computing solution. This web-based system promotes more efficient operations through the use of employee self-service capabilities such as online booking, electronic routing capabilities to streamline the approval process, and automated interfaces with the Department's financial systems to ensure more accurate and timely employee reimbursements (of out-of-pocket travel expenses). Importantly, these activities can be performed securely at post, at home, or on the road (using any computer connected to the internet). The impact of a significant funding cut is largely dependent on the outcome of GSA's ETS2 acquisition activity. Should CW Government Travel continue to offer services to government agencies under ETS2, the lack of full funding would not impact the investment as it would be unnecessary to execute the contingency activities associated with migrating to a new provider. However, if migrating to a new e-Travel services provider becomes necessary under ETS2, the effort would undoubtedly be delayed. This could place the Department in an untenable position should CW Government Travel pull out of the business once its ETS1 contract ends.

**3. Provide a list of this investment's accomplishments in the prior year (PY), including projects or useful components/project segments completed, new functionality added, or operational efficiency achieved.**

Planned accomplishments for CY12 include: \* Complete the phased, global deployment of e2 Solutions. \* Migrate all bureaus and posts to a major new release of e2 Solutions (that has been designed to improve usability/efficiency). \* Retire the legacy Travel Manager system. \* Select an ETS2 services provider and develop a redeployment strategy (if necessary).

**4. Provide a list of planned accomplishments for current year (CY) and budget year (BY).**

Planned accomplishments for BY13 include: \* Modify and test interfaces to/from ETS1 to align with product improvements. \* Design, develop, and test software enhancements to a "to be determined" ETS2 offering to support a redeployment under ETS2 (if necessary). \* Begin a phased, worldwide redeployment of a "to be determined" ETS2 offering (if necessary).  
Planned accomplishments for BY14 include: \* Modify and test interfaces to/from ETS1 to align with product improvements. \* Continue the phased, worldwide redeployment of a "to be determined" ETS2 offering (if necessary).

**5. Provide the date of the Charter establishing the required Integrated Program Team (IPT) for this investment. An IPT must always include, but is not limited to: a qualified fully-dedicated IT program manager, a contract specialist, an information technology**

**specialist, a security specialist and a business process owner before OMB will approve this program investment budget. IT Program Manager, Business Process Owner and Contract Specialist must be Government Employees.**

2011-08-18

## Section C: Summary of Funding (Budget Authority for Capital Assets)

1.

Table I.C.1 Summary of Funding

	PY-1 & Prior	PY 2011	CY 2012	BY 2013
Planning Costs:	\$2.8	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
DME (Excluding Planning) Costs:	\$13.2	\$3.8	\$5.3	\$5.7
DME (Including Planning) Govt. FTEs:	\$0.0	\$0.5	\$0.4	\$0.5
Sub-Total DME (Including Govt. FTE):	\$16.0	\$4.3	\$5.7	\$6.2
O & M Costs:	\$2.8	\$1.2	\$2.0	\$1.5
O & M Govt. FTEs:	\$0.6	\$0.2	\$0.3	\$0.4
Sub-Total O & M Costs (Including Govt. FTE):	\$3.4	\$1.4	\$2.3	\$1.9
Total Cost (Including Govt. FTE):	\$19.4	\$5.7	\$8.0	\$8.1
Total Govt. FTE costs:	\$0.6	\$0.7	\$0.7	\$0.9
# of FTE rep by costs:	6	6	6	8
Total change from prior year final President's Budget (\$)		\$1.3	\$2.1	
Total change from prior year final President's Budget (%)		30.90%	35.30%	

**2. If the funding levels have changed from the FY 2012 President's Budget request for PY or CY, briefly explain those changes:**

As a contingency, the costs of acquiring a new e-Travel services provider have been added. This was done in response to GSA's re-compete of the government-wide e-Travel contract.

## Section D: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

Table I.D.1 Contracts and Acquisition Strategy

Contract Type	EVM Required	Contracting Agency ID	Procurement Instrument Identifier (PIID)	Indefinite Delivery Vehicle (IDV) Reference ID	IDV Agency ID	Solicitation ID	Ultimate Contract Value (\$M)	Type	PBSA ?	Effective Date	Actual or Expected End Date
---------------	--------------	-----------------------	--	--	---------------	-----------------	-------------------------------	------	--------	----------------	-----------------------------

NONE

**2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:**

The contract vehicle listed in row 3 was negotiated by GSA on behalf of the entire federal government to advance the e-Travel initiative. Per the Federal Travel Regulation (FTR), the Department is required to use this vehicle even though it does not contain an EVM requirement.

## Exhibit 300B: Performance Measurement Report

### Section A: General Information

**Date of Last Change to Activities:** 2012-08-31

### Section B: Project Execution Data

**Table II.B.1 Projects**

Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Start Date	Project Completion Date	Project Lifecycle Cost (\$M)
3	e-Gov Travel Service (ETS1) DME	The purpose of this project is to migrate DoS to a GSA approved e-Gov Travel provider and enhance e2 Solutions to address Department of State specific business requirements.			
4	Contingency to support the e-Gov Travel Service II (ETS2) initiative	The purpose of this activity is to conduct the due diligence necessary to determine whether any ETS2 service providers meet the Department's travel requirements under this government-wide initiative managed by GSA.			

### Activity Summary

Roll-up of Information Provided in Lowest Level Child Activities

Project ID	Name	Total Cost of Project Activities (\$M)	End Point Schedule Variance (in days)	End Point Schedule Variance (%)	Cost Variance (\$M )	Cost Variance (%)	Total Planned Cost (\$M)	Count of Activities
3	e-Gov Travel Service (ETS1) DME							
4	Contingency to							

## Activity Summary

Roll-up of Information Provided in Lowest Level Child Activities

Project ID	Name	Total Cost of Project Activities (\$M)	End Point Schedule Variance (in days)	End Point Schedule Variance (%)	Cost Variance (\$M )	Cost Variance (%)	Total Planned Cost (\$M)	Count of Activities
	support the e-Gov Travel Service II (ETS2) initiative							

## Key Deliverables

Project Name	Activity Name	Description	Planned Completion Date	Projected Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Duration (in days)	Schedule Variance (in days )	Schedule Variance (%)
3	Development of User Driven Enhancements FY11	This activity consists of the design, development, testing, and documentation of e2 Solutions enhancements funded by the Department to address DoS specific business requirements not addressed by the ETS1 offering used by the Department. Most of these enhancements address requirements related to overseas travel.	2011-09-30		2011-09-30	364	0	0.00%
3	Program Management (PMO)		2011-09-30		2011-09-30	364	0	0.00%
4	Due Diligence and Vendor Selection	Evaluate ETS2 offerings and develop recommended ETS2 services provider for the Department.	2011-09-30		2011-09-30	272	0	0.00%



## Section C: Operational Data

Table II.C.1 Performance Metrics

Metric Description	Unit of Measure	FEA Performance Measurement Category Mapping	Measurement Condition	Baseline	Target for PY	Actual for PY	Target for CY	Reporting Frequency
% of TDY travel vouchers processed via fully automated, end-to-end travel service system (Travel Manager or eTS)	percent	Process and Activities - Management and Innovation	Over target	35.000000	85.000000	95.000000	95.000000	Semi-Annual
# of quality reports available to management on travel costs and related information	number	Technology - Information and Data	Over target	3.000000	18.000000	45.000000	21.000000	Monthly
% of travel reservations worldwide booked via self-service on-line tool	percent	Process and Activities - Management and Innovation	Over target	0.000000	15.000000	39.000000	15.000000	Semi-Annual
Time required to generate automated reimbursements to overseas employees supported by E-2 solutions.	average days	Customer Results - Customer Benefit	Under target	6.000000	3.500000	3.500000	3.500000	Semi-Annual
Percentage of Section 508 compliant systems.	percent	Customer Results - Customer Benefit	Over target	0.000000	50.000000	50.000000	100.000000	Semi-Annual